



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

*THE PRESENT POSITION OF NEW TESTAMENT
THEOLOGY*

ERNEST F. SCOTT

QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY, KINGSTON, CANADA

It is not a little significant that several books have appeared within the last year or two which deal with the subject of New Testament Theology in its whole extent. For a considerable time there has been a shrinking from this large enterprise, and the work of Holtzmann was allowed to maintain its place without serious competition. The attention of younger scholars has been more directed to the literary and historical criticism of the New Testament than to its theology; and while the theology has been by no means neglected, it has been discussed in many separate monographs rather than in works of a comprehensive nature. Now, however, we have the three books of Weinell, Feine, and Schlatter, appearing almost simultaneously, while the monumental work of Holtzmann is being reissued in a fully revised edition.

This sudden outburst of activity in a field that seemed almost abandoned may be taken in several ways as a good omen. It points, for one thing, to a revival of interest in the thought of the New Testament, which has often been half-forgotten in the controversy over subsidiary problems. Again, it is an indication that the many-sided researches of modern scholarship have yielded some assured results, so that constructive work may at last be attempted. For a number of years past, scholars have been fully occupied with the collecting of fresh data and the weighing of rival theories; the process was a necessary one, and had to be carried out with sufficient thoroughness before any conclusions could be more than tentative. It would appear that these preliminary labors are approaching completion, and that the work of building is now to be commenced. Once more, the appearance of these books, in which the primitive theology is treated as a whole, bears witness to a growing conviction that New

Testament thought is far more closely linked together than the critics of the last generation were willing to admit. The tendency has been to emphasize the cleavage between Jesus and Paul, and between Paul and the later church, with the result that each of the several phases of early doctrine has been studied in a compartment by itself. It is now coming to be recognized that no sharp lines of separation can be drawn, and that the teaching of the New Testament must be taken as a whole before we can rightly apprehend the bearing of its different parts.

We propose in this article to consider two of the works recently published, in order to arrive at some estimate of the present position of New Testament Theology and the outlook for the future. A review of four such comprehensive books is hardly practicable, and two of them, for different reasons, may be left out of account. The revised edition of Holtzmann is not yet completed, and any judgment on it would be premature; while the work of Schlatter, able and suggestive as it is, is not sufficiently representative for our purposes. The author prides himself on treating his subject from a point of view and according to methods which are peculiar to himself, and tries as far as possible to forget everything that has previously been written about it. His book is well worthy of study as the work of a vigorous though eccentric thinker, but it stands for nothing except his own individual views. Weinle and Feine, on the other hand, are representative in a high degree. Their aim is not so much to advocate private theories as to gather up the whole result of modern investigation, while in the performance of this task one of them adopts a somewhat radical and the other a somewhat conservative attitude.

By way of approach to the two books it will be well to indicate some of the new material of which the writers have been able to avail themselves, and which has made their work necessary. Holtzmann's great book has qualities of thoroughness, erudition, philosophical insight, that stamp it with a permanent value; and the revision which it is now undergoing at the hands of Jülicher will secure it in the place which it has long occupied. But since the last edition of Holtzmann in 1897 the whole position of New Testament theology has become different. The labors of many scholars in widely diverse fields of Biblical research have not only

accumulated fresh data for answering the various problems, but have compelled, in almost every instance, a new statement of the problem itself.

1. Documents external to the New Testament but illustrative of its thought and beliefs have been more carefully examined. (a) The apocalyptic literature has received closer attention. Its sources, purpose and character are far better understood than they were twenty years ago; and its influence on early Christian ideas has been investigated in detail. The results of this study alone, though on some cardinal points they are still far from certain, have been little short of revolutionary. (b) Rabbinical literature has become more accessible, and in the light of it we are better able to appreciate certain aspects of New Testament thought. One of the most hopeful signs of recent years has been the increasing willingness of Jewish and Christian scholars to co-operate. The Jewish Encyclopedia, the commentary on the Synoptic Gospels by Montefiore and Abrahams, the contributions of Schechter and others, have done much to correct and supplement our traditional ideas of the New Testament. (c) The interest in Philo has undergone a marked revival within the last few years. His works have been critically edited for the first time by Cohn and Wendland. Discussions like those of Bréhier and Windisch have enabled us to apprehend his thought more fairly. The whole question of Alexandrian speculation has been placed on a new footing by the discovery of Egyptian as well as Greek affinities in the system of Philo. (d) The influence of Greek, and especially Stoic, philosophy on the New Testament has long been recognized; but it is only of late years that the points of contact between Paul's Epistles and the Diatribe literature have been noted and investigated by Wendland, Bultmann, and others. It has thus become possible to estimate in a more accurate manner the relation of Paul's thinking to the current philosophy. (e) The researches of Deissmann and others have taught us how the New Testament writers were affected by the popular Hellenistic ideas. It may be that Deissmann has tried to prove too much from purely linguistic evidence, but there can be no question that the new data have cleared up many points of detail which were previously obscure. (f) An entirely

fresh light has been thrown on early Christian thought by the study of the Oriental mystery-religions, especially by Reitzenstein, Cumont, and Dieterich. This line of inquiry has only been opened up in recent years, and the conclusions which have been reached are of a more or less tentative character. Many scholars are perhaps disposed to make too much of the new discoveries, and to miss what is essential in Christian thought by reading everything in terms of the Oriental cults. But it can hardly be questioned that we have now learned to distinguish a new and important element which must be taken into account in all future expositions of the primitive theology.

2. The literary criticism of the New Testament has been notably advanced by the labors of the last ten or fifteen years; and a more accurate knowledge of the structure and origin of the various writings has helped to elucidate their teaching. In two cases, more especially, literary criticism has reacted on our study of the theology. (a) It would be too bold to persuade ourselves that the Synoptic problem is approaching anything like a final solution; but the different strata in the evangelic tradition have now been so far determined that the analysis of the teaching of Jesus may be based on certain definite principles. We can distinguish, with a confidence hitherto impossible, between the earliest records and the later interpretations. (b) The book of Acts has recovered something of its former significance. By our attitude to this book our view of the whole course of early Christianity must be largely determined; and, while such a position as that of Harnack in his later studies can hardly be maintained, it seems clear that Acts must now be taken seriously as an historical document. The analytical criticism of the introductory chapters (Harnack, Clemen, Jungst, and others) has been especially valuable, since it has established a strong probability that in his account of the most ancient period the author made use of sources which can still, in some measure, be recognized.

3. Separate aspects of New Testament thought have been very fully investigated in recent years; and not a few of the monographs have marked a real addition to our knowledge. It will be enough simply to mention the works of Heitmüller on the baptismal formula; of Gunkel and Volz on the Spirit; of A. See-

berg on the primitive confession; of Lietzmann and Fiebig on the Son of Man. In this connection, too, we may note the commentaries, many of them of quite exceptional value, which have appeared since the beginning of the century, such as J. Weiss on 1 Corinthians, Loisy on the Synoptic Gospels, Bousset on Revelation, Bacon on Mark and Galatians. Questions of exegesis have been so treated in many of these recent commentaries as to illuminate the larger theological problems.

On all sides, then, a great mass of fresh and valuable material has been collected for the writer on New Testament Theology. His task has in some ways been rendered more complex, but in others has been lightened and simplified. He can make use of well-made roads where his predecessors had to hew their own way through the jungle, and can advance to positive results without wasting his labor on mere controversy. It must indeed be admitted that the last few years have had their full share of wild theories, as well as of solid and fruitful work. Echoes are still heard of Van Manen's attack on the authenticity of Paul's Epistles. The old debate as to whether Jesus was an historical person has been revived in new forms. Attempts have been made to construe the early Christian movement by means of categories borrowed from modern Socialism. But these mere fire-works of criticism have already enjoyed the brief moment in which they have had time to spend themselves. They have served a useful purpose by bringing out into clearer relief the assured facts which have to be studied and interpreted.

It would be difficult to say which of the two books before us is the better done; and happily it is not necessary. Both of them are works of remarkable ability, thorough in their treatment, honest and fair-minded in their conclusions. Weinel's, it will be generally acknowledged, is the more brilliant and original book: Feine's is perhaps the more useful for the purposes of the student. By a fortunate accident the two books, which might have easily stood in mere rivalry, serve to complement each other and will be found equally necessary. While both writers are at pains to hold the balances even and to bring every question into the fullest modern light, Weinel reflects the opinions of the more ad-

vanced criticism, while Feine is more cautious, and prefers in case of doubt to fall back on orthodox positions. This will become apparent as we proceed to outline some of the more salient features of the two discussions.

Weinel¹ lays stress at the outset on the close relation between the thought and the life of the primitive church, and shows that the old conception of an abstract development of doctrine is misleading. Throughout his book—and this perhaps is its chief excellence—he tries to make us feel that Christian thinking in the first century was only the other side of Christian history and experience. His first care is to define the specific character of Christianity as distinguished from the religions amidst which it arose, and which, in some cases, superficially resembled it. It was a religion of redemption, unlike the moral-ceremonial religion of Judaism. At the same time it was not an aesthetic redemptive religion, like the Oriental cults; that is, it did not aim at deliverance merely from the sense of suffering and earthly limitation. It was an ethical-redemptive religion, seeking its goal in the deliverance from moral unworthiness. From this point of view Weinell discusses the teaching of Jesus. He fully admits the apocalyptic framework of the teaching, but shows that its true affinities were with Old Testament prophecy. Jesus was concerned, not so much with the Kingdom itself as with the conditions on which men might enter it; and these conditions were of a moral nature. Mysticism had no place in the thought of Jesus, and his seeming asceticism was in reality a demand for sacrifice. On the basis of the apocalyptic idea of the Kingdom he perfected the ethical religion, insisting on obedience to the will of God, and separating that will from everything that is not morally good and holy. The fundamental idea of a life according to the will of God brought with it a new conception of God and of man's relation to him. God is at once absolute Lord and absolute goodness; and by faith in him man is regenerated, that is, made capable of a new moral life, depending on new impulses. As in the aesthetic religions man is redeemed from natural limitations, so in the religion of Jesus he is redeemed from moral impotence and failure,

¹ *Biblische Theologie des Neuen Testaments*, von H. Weinell. Tübingen, J. C. B. Mohr. 1911. pp. 603.

and receives power for doing and willing what is good. These points are all elaborated and illustrated by Weinel in a section which occupies about a third of his book, and in which his special qualities of vivid presentation and fresh perception can be seen at their best. He has done valuable service in asserting once more those great religious and moral elements of Jesus' teaching which a pedantic criticism would resolve into mere by-products of an apocalyptic message. At the same time he has not tried to make sufficiently clear the nexus between the apocalyptic and ethical sides of the teaching. In the closing chapters of the section he deals with Jesus' conception of his own person and office; and here again the treatment is somewhat inconclusive. Jesus accepted his Messianic vocation as a prophetic one. It is probable that he conceived of himself as in some peculiar sense the Son of God; probable also that when he spoke of the coming of the Son of Man, he thought of his own return in glory. But he claimed to be Messiah primarily because he brought to men the true knowledge of God and realized the Fatherly will of God in his own life. Though he recognizes the substantial authenticity of the accounts of the Last Supper, Weinel refuses to admit any idea of an atonement in the thought of Jesus.

After a chapter on the primitive community (which to our mind is too brief and inadequate), Weinel passes to Paul, from the canon of whose writings he excludes Ephesians and Colossians as well as the Pastorals. With Paul Christianity becomes subjective and psychological, an interpretation of the Apostle's own experience rather than an objective message. This is the chief difference between Paul and Jesus, though essentially they are far more closely related than is generally supposed. Paul was fully acquainted with the teaching of Jesus. Like him he insisted on an ethical redemption, and pierced the shell of the Law in order to reach the unity of an ideal. But while he grasped the true meaning of Jesus' teaching, he read it through his own experience and presented it in his own way.

What Paul seeks from religion is, above all, *power*—power to overcome not only moral hindrances, but the intrinsic weakness of the flesh and the dominion of evil spirits. The doctrine of Justification, therefore, is not the whole of Paulinism. Along

with the "righteousness of God," Paul aims at obtaining a redemption which is dynamical and metaphysical in its nature. The death of Christ is invested with a cosmical significance. It effects the overthrow of the powers hostile to man, in addition to its worth as an atoning sacrifice. Weinel is surely on doubtful ground when he seeks to explain the doctrine of the Atonement by Jewish sacrificial ideas. He puts the whole doctrine, however, in a clearer light by his proof that with Paul the guiding principle of the atonement is the love of God, not his honor or justice or holiness, as in the later theology.

The most suggestive part of the Pauline section is that which treats of Paul's mysticism. Weinel traces this element of the Apostle's thinking to three roots: the mystery-religions; the manifestations of the Spirit in the community; Paul's own experience of Christ. These influences all worked together, and it is wrong to emphasize any one of them to the exclusion of the others. The mystical side of Paulinism is regarded by Weinel as a sort of other religion, parallel to the redemption-religion, but never wholly identified with it. So far, indeed, as Paul relates his mysticism to the sacraments, he falls back on a type of religion which had no real place in Christianity. At the same time, his mysticism is ultimately independent of the sacraments, which only serve to focus for him the results of spiritual experience. In his account of Paul's Christology, Weinel assigns an altogether subordinate place to Jewish Messianic speculation. For the most part Paul thinks of Christ as the Heavenly Man; while at times he seems to conceive of him after the analogy of the mystery-gods, or as one with the Holy Spirit.

The theology subsequent to Paul is treated as a single whole, under the rubric of "The Christianity of the developing Church." This method of treatment has no doubt certain advantages. It brings to light the points of connection between the different theological forces which were working towards the catholicism of the second century; the later writings of the New Testament are made to illustrate one another, and stress is laid on the essential features of the development rather than on mere side-issues. But we are inclined to question the wisdom of the new arrangement. It is true that Ephesians, Hebrews, and the Fourth Gospel

all represent phases of a single movement, but each of them has an individuality which is blurred in the composite picture set before us by Weinel. To understand his view, say of the Epistle to the Hebrews, we require to turn to seven or eight different sections (Apologetic, Ethics, Mysticism, etc.), and piece together the references to the given writing. Even then, they are disconnected, and the relation, often so suggestive, of ethics to doctrine, ecclesiastical thought to mysticism, falls out of sight. The fault is hardly remedied by the rather clumsy device of an appendix in which the main conceptions of the various books are brought together in brief outline.

In this last part of his work, Weinel shows how sub-Pauline Christianity was moulded by historical conditions—the spread of the new religion among the proletariat of the great cities, the infiltration of Pagan and philosophical ideas, the strengthening of the church as an institution. The Jewish Christians divided into three parties, represented by Peter, James, and the extreme Judaists. Paulinism likewise took three directions: (a) Paul himself, who never absolutely broke with Judaism; (b) his heathen converts, whose anti-Jewish attitude we can discern in the Epistle to the Romans; (c) the radical, or Gnostic, sectaries. These various tendencies, by their conflict and interaction, produced catholic Christianity. Gnostic rationalism and the eschatological hope were both intensified; sacramental ideas became prominent; the Pauline doctrine of grace was maintained, but works were allowed a value alongside of grace. In the Johannine writings (i.e. the Gospel and the First Epistle) the Christ-mysticism of Paul merges in a God-mysticism, which is rendered possible by a new conception of God, peculiar to this writer. The simplicity of personal faith in God is transcended, and God is conceived under abstract categories as Spirit, Love, Light. Apocalyptic hopes are transformed into their inward and spiritual equivalents; and through the influence of mystical ideas, the Pauline certainty of salvation becomes metaphysical. In John, as in Paul, mysticism allies itself with sacramental doctrine, but with him also it is ultimately independent—the substance to which the sacraments supply a form. Weinel's account of the Johannine theology, though exceedingly fresh and able, is spoiled by the fault

of arrangement which we have already noted. The Fourth Gospel, more than any other New Testament writing, reflects a variety of interests, which are yet blended together harmoniously. When the ethical, polemical, ecclesiastical, philosophical, and mystical sides of its teaching are all detached from one another, we are apt to miss the peculiar essence which belongs to the Gospel as a whole.

The work of Feine² is mapped out according to the old divisions: the teaching of Jesus, the beliefs of the primitive community, Paul, the sub-Pauline writings taken one by one, the Johannine theology. Ephesians and Colossians are given to Paul, and even the question of the Pastorals is left open. It is considered probable that the Apocalypse is by the same author as the Gospel and Epistles of John, although due weight is allowed to arguments on the other side. About half of the large volume is allotted to the theology of Paul; and this, which is the most elaborate, is also, to our mind, the most valuable section of the book. The exposition of the teaching of Jesus is full and thorough, and like all the other sections is admirably clear in its summary of modern results; but we miss the vividness and penetration of Weinel. There is too much of an attempt to classify the ideas of Jesus according to a theological scheme, and their living and creative power is left unexplained.

As the guiding principle in his whole presentation, Feine takes the idea of the Messianic consciousness. Jesus claimed to be the Messiah, intrusted by God with the execution of his saving purposes, and on this claim all his teaching centred. The first disciples accepted the testimony of Jesus to himself, and verified it by religious experience. Paul interpreted this experience and brought it under theological conceptions, while John realized it in its fulness by finding in Jesus the absolute revelation of God. Now it may be granted that Jesus' consciousness of a unique relation to the Father was the ultimate basis and sanction of all his work; and in this sense the construction of Feine may be justified. But there can surely be little doubt that the Kingdom was the primary theme of his teaching, and that the claim to

²Theologie des Neuen Testaments. Von Paul Feine. Leipzig, J. C. Hinrichs, 1910. pp. 714. 2te Auflage, 1911.

Messiahship grew out of his reflection on his own significance for the Kingdom. In reading the book generally, and the first section in particular, we have an uneasy feeling that the whole structure is made to rest on its apex.

Feine allows for a considerable development in the thought of the church before the appearance of Paul. He believes that the influence of the Jewish controversy on Paul has often been overrated. Paul's doctrine was fixed in its main outlines before the controversy began, and was essentially the doctrine of the church from the beginning. Paul himself, though the first Christian theologian, was not a systematic thinker. Parts of his teaching were worked out with comparative fulness; parts were merely sketched, and were not brought into harmony with the main body of his thought. In fact, we are to regard Paulinism as a mosaic of doctrine, although it is also true that the whole is suggested by each part.

Feine examines with care and impartiality the various attempts to deduce the Pauline teaching from Jewish eschatology, Stoic speculation, Oriental Gnosis. To such views of its origin he concedes this much of truth, that Paul endeavored to express his doctrines, and even his most vital doctrines, in terms of contemporary thought. But he insists that the one true method is to start from Paul's religious experience. He clothes the revelation that came to him through Christ in forms provided for him by the thought of the age, not *vice versa*. Even in his Christ-mysticism he did not borrow anything essential from the Oriental cults, for none of these knew of an historical person, with a moral and religious significance. The two roots, then, of Paul's theology were (1) the self-witness of Jesus, (2) his own religious experience, especially that of his conversion. Paulinism cannot be understood except as the theological presentation of the historical fact of Jesus. What the age was longing for and striving to express in its myths and philosophies had for Paul become a reality.

In the doctrine of Justification the Pauline teaching finds its centre. Justification, indeed, is for Paul the whole of salvation; and we pervert his thought when we distinguish other processes supplementary to it. The man whom God has justified is also

actively righteous; he receives a new power, and is filled with the desire to attain to the highest moral ideal. In his statement of the doctrine Paul employs a Jewish conception, but entirely changes its content; and in like manner he deals with faith. In Judaism, faith was a work of merit; with Paul it consists in the willingness to receive God's grace, and even this willingness is wrought in men by God. Feine lays just emphasis on the idea, cardinal to Paul, that God always takes the initiative. Man is reconciled to God, not God to man; but the desire and capacity for reconciliation must be the work of God in a man's heart. Paul's whole teaching is based on this conception that everything is given by God, of his own free grace.

The mystical side of Paulinism is inadequately treated, and this is true likewise of the doctrine of the Spirit, which is so closely allied to it. Feine is over-anxious to maintain his thesis that Paul's one interest is in the moral and religious renewal effected by Christ. He acknowledges that the Spirit, in accordance with the thought of the time, is conceived semi-physically, and is supposed to work a change in man's nature as well as in his will. But he insists that all the time Paul is seeking to subordinate the natural to the moral categories. The affinities of Pauline thought with Gnosticism are barely recognized.

Before passing to the Johannine theology, Feine carefully reviews the intermediate writings; and his conclusions on most of them will be generally accepted, although he is apt to offer compromises which are not altogether happy. He grants, for instance, that first Peter is a sub-Pauline document, in which the teaching of Paul is diluted with popular ideas and used for the support of ethical exhortation. But he argues for the authority of Peter behind the Epistle, and concludes that Silvanus probably wrote it from hints which Peter supplied. In the chapter on the Apocalypse an admirable exposition is in some measure vitiated by the forlorn attempt to force the book into harmony with the Fourth Gospel. When he comes to the Fourth Gospel itself, Feine's attitude to the critical question is conservative, but he accepts in substance the modern view of the theology. John interprets the Synoptic picture of the life of Jesus through the medium of Pauline doctrine. He transcends the primitive escha-

tology, though in deference to the teaching of the church he makes occasional concessions to it which are inconsistent with his own thought. The Christology of the Prologue is that of the whole Gospel, and is based on the Logos-theory of Philo; yet the Gospel is something else than a history of the Logos. John fills the Philonic idea with a new content, and employs it in order that he may set forth in clear relief the divine character of the Person and work of Jesus. The conception of the Logos is blended throughout with that of Life, which, according to Feine, must be understood in a religious, not in a metaphysical or seminatural sense. Jesus, by the revelation of himself, brings us into a living fellowship with God.

In this brief sketch it has been possible only to indicate a few of the more characteristic features of the two presentations. As was inevitable, the writers differ continually, not only in their mode of treatment, but in their estimates and conclusions. More striking, however, than the differences are the many elements of agreement in these two works, written from points of view which we have been used to think of as conflicting. There seems good reason to believe that conservative and radical scholars are gradually throwing off their old attitude of mere antagonism. They are beginning to realize that, although they have set out from opposite sides, they are working towards the same goal and will finally shake hands.

Apart from numberless agreements in points of detail, we may note several of the broader lines of approximation which are revealed in the two books before us. (1) It is no longer denied that even the earliest Christianity was in some measure composite. Feine is no less willing than Weinel to allow for the influence of contemporary movements in philosophy and religion. He grants that the permanent message of the gospel was expressed in forms that were borrowed from the age, and requires, in some measure, to be disengaged from them. (2) These alien influences are coming to be recognized as secondary. For a long time yet we may have to reckon with theories that Paulinism was nothing but a Jewish or Oriental theosophy, that the Fourth Gospel was a belated Philonic treatise, that Jesus himself was concerned wholly

with the apocalyptic hope. But these extreme views are becoming less and less tenable, and the essential originality of the Christian movement is steadily asserting itself. Now that the first flush of discovery is over, the new factors which were supposed to explain everything are subsiding into their place. Due weight must always be assigned to them, but the New Testament scholar has to reach beyond them to that which was native and specific in Christian thought. (3) The theory of sharp antagonisms among the early teachers of the church has now been abandoned. Some conflict there undoubtedly was, but we are learning to realize that the different parties were far closer to one another than was formerly supposed. Instead of a development through strife, there was an orderly progress, due partly to the operation of new influences, and partly to the gradual unfolding of ideas that had been present from the beginning. (4) As to the general course which the progress followed, there is now little difference of opinion. It is admitted that after the death of Paul his ideas were combined with others of a more popular character. It is admitted, likewise, that the Fourth Gospel, whatever may have been its origin, presupposes the theology of Paul. In spite of many obscurities in matters of detail, the broad stages of the development are so well ascertained that New Testament doctrine can now be treated historically.

But while the comparison of these two books affords evidence of results now practically assured, it also reminds us of the many questions which still await a further investigation. It will be enough to mention only a few of the more important. (1) All scholars are now agreed that the thought of Jesus contained a large apocalyptic element, but we have still to determine its precise nature and extent. Above all, the relation of the apocalyptic to the moral and religious aspects of the teaching is altogether uncertain. (2) The beliefs of the earliest community and their connection with Jesus' message of the Kingdom have never been adequately examined. In the two books before us, just as in the older works, the primitive theology is treated in a meagre and perfunctory fashion. We are left with the impression that between Jesus and Paul there was a confused interval, in which the new religion was in danger of narrowing down into a mere sect of

Judaism. It can hardly be doubted, however, that this interval, of which we know so little, was the true formative period of Christian thought and belief. A closer analysis of the data, scanty and uncertain as they are, may yet reveal to us the line of continuity from the teaching of Jesus to that of Paul and the later church. (3) The whole subject of Paulinism is full of unsolved problems. It may be granted that the old conception of Paul as a systematic thinker was a mistaken one; but the modern account of his theology as a mosaic of disconnected fragments is even more unsatisfying. One cannot but feel that the true key to Paulinism has yet to be discovered. The apparent contradictions which it presents to us are due to our ignorance quite as much as to any want of system and cohesion in the Apostle's own thought. (4) The doctrine of the Spirit requires to be considered more fully, in its many-sided bearing on the life and theology of the early church. It is only in recent years that an intelligent study of this doctrine has become possible; and our understanding of it is still very far from adequate. Its background in Jewish, Oriental, and philosophical thought has only been partially determined, and the course of its development within the New Testament itself has never been traced out with sufficient thoroughness. Why did the idea of the Spirit assume such prominence in the early community? How far and in what sense was it derived from Jesus himself? Through what changes did it pass in its elaboration by Paul and the Fourth Evangelist? How was it related to the doctrines of baptism, the church, the new life? These questions have not yet been really answered, and they are vital to the whole theology of the New Testament. (5) A more careful inquiry must be made into the history of apocalyptic ideas in the early church. At present we are unable to determine whether the apocalyptic hope became stronger or weaker after Jesus' death; whether the evangelists, in deference to later feeling, have toned down this side of his message or exaggerated it. We cannot say how far the life of the church was controlled by eschatological and how far by purely moral and spiritual motives. The merging of apocalyptic in mystical thought, as we find it in the Fourth Gospel, has never been fully explained. (6) The great Christological problem still baffles us

—indeed it has become more difficult than ever. Modern investigation has all tended to make it certain that the divinizing of Jesus began much earlier than the criticism of the last century would allow. The process was already completed, as Weinel is willing to admit, in the lifetime of Paul. How are we to account for this estimate of Jesus, which overstepped the Messianic categories almost from the beginning? These are only a few of the more outstanding questions that are now pressing for a solution; and, apart from these, almost every book of the New Testament offers its own peculiar problems. In the case of many of the writings theological and critical difficulties are bound up together. The critical analysis must be carried a good deal further before any treatment of the theology can be other than provisional.

As yet, therefore, we have by no means reached the end in the investigation of New Testament thought. The field at first sight appears a narrow one, and multitudes of scholars have been working in it diligently for a hundred years; but all the progress has only served to reveal the largeness and complexity of the task. We were ready to believe at the close of the last century that at least the main positions had been securely established, and ever since then materials have been accumulating which have compelled us to build afresh. A dozen years ago the apocalyptic groundwork of Jesus' teaching was barely suspected; the influence of the Oriental cults on Paulinism was hardly dreamed of. These two factors, so recently discovered, have changed the whole current of New Testament inquiry; and who can doubt that others, no less significant, will yet come to light? It will be long before the final exposition of New Testament theology can be written; but meanwhile we are thankful for books so excellent as those which have been reviewed. They summarize with admirable clearness and fairness the latest results of scholarship, and define the points of departure for a fresh advance.